



An Account of a DISPUTE

Betwixt Mr. Clayton Prebendary of St. Michan's, and Father Dalton, Priest of the same Parish, on the 18th of August, 1702.

About three Weeks ago, Mr. Clayton met accidentally with one Mrs. Joy a Member of the Church of Rome, with whom he enter'd into Discourse finding her very ready at all those Texts of Scripture the Romanists Cite; but after two or three Conferences, she own'd she had conceiv'd such scruples, that the Roman Priest must either satisfy her therein, or she would come over to the Church of England, and asked Mr. Clayton to meet one of them, which he promised he would readily do. *August* the 18th, a little Girl came to Mr. Clayton's, and told him a Priest was with the Gentlewoman, whereupon he went in all haste, and found it was Father Dalton, Mr. Clayton Saluted him civilly, and immediately asked whether they had been Discouraging of Religion? Mrs. Joy reply'd, *she had been asking his Advice about some Points*. Mr. Clayton desired to know what it was they were upon. She reply'd, *about the Communion*. Presently Father Dalton put the Question, *Whether Christ had not said, this is my body, and whether his words were not true?*

Mr. Clayton, Both must be allow'd, but the Dispute is, about the intent and import of the Words.

Father Dalton, *They have a natural signification, and why shou'd they be forc'd or wrested.*

Mr. Cl. To take words in a common acception and mode of Speech, whether Allegorical or Natural is not forcing them, and this being spoak ta the Passover it was a common Phrase to say, *this is the body of the Passover*, when it was not that very body, but a commemoration; and the like interpretation seems natural, because it is added, *do this in remembrance*, or as St. Paul words it, *in commemoration*.

F. Dalton may be a remembrance, and yet be his body.

Mr. Cl. That is, it may be the thing, and not the thing at the same time, for remembrance implies, that that is not the thing it self whereby we are to remember any thing, but a pledge or similitude thereof.

F. D. The words are very express, this is my body.

Mr. Cl. Christs words are as express after Consecration, *I will drink no more of the fruite of the vine*, and St. Paul calls it as positively *Bread*, does not Christ say as expressly, *I am the door, I am the vine?*

F. D. There is no parallel reason, Christ was then making his last Will and Testament, and therein Persons use to be as plain, and clear as may be.

Mr. Cl. If you take it for a Will and Testament, such as dying Persons make when they dispose of their Goods, it has neither form nor fashion thereof.

F. D. Does not Christ expressly call it, my blood of the new Testament?

M.C. Right, but *Testament* there signifies the Covenant made betwixt God and us, and this was the Seal of the new Covenant Seal'd once with his blood when he was Crucified, and there is no third or more Covenants to be made. But as we are admitted into this Covenant at first by a certain form or ceremonial tipe of Purification. So as oft as we break or forfeit the Indenture or Covenant, may we renew it by a Ceremony as effectual as the first spilling of his blood, for this is as his blood.

F. D. But it is positively, this is my blood.

Mr. C. We deny not the words, but the acceptation of them in a sense of *Transubstantiation*.

Mrs. Joy, The new Testament is annex't to the blood, *this is the blood of the new Testament*, and my greatest scruple has been, that we have not that blood.

F. D. But you have the body that contains the blood.

Mr. C. But her words have force, the new Testament is never adjoin'd to the body but to the blood, if Christ administer both under the species of bread, why should not the Testament be annexed thereto, and why did Christ superadd the blood, as if the Covenant were not consummated till that was administer'd, but defer'd the denomination to the perfecting thereof, the blood being always term'd as the Seal, and St. Paul who receiv'd the Account of the institution from Christ himself a year after his death, gives the same order and form of administration of both, with the like connection of the Testament to the Cup, that without it, it seems as a Covenant or Lease without a Seal.

F. D. Sometimes it was administer'd in the antient Church, sometimes it was not, and they may have it, or not have it, as may be judged requisite.

Mr. C. I do say, you cannot prove certainly, that the bread was ever administer'd singly by any clear Testimony; but if there was any one irregular action of what importance is that, it was never the ordinance of any one Church for 1000 or 1400 years after Christ, and as for what you say, they may have it or not have it as they please; you are under an Anathema of your Councils,

(which is either your Church or we know not where, to find that, that you brag is so eminently placed on a hill) if you either administer it to Jaicks or advise that it may be done.

F. D. Oh, there's no such thing.

Mr. C. I do assert there is such a decree in the Council of Constance, immediately following the *non Obstante* decree that took away the Cup, notwithstanding they allow'd it contrary to the ordinance of Christ.

F. D. I assure you there is no such thing.

Mr. C. There can be nothing further, but that it is false, and it is false, come i'le put the whole issue upon it, and i'le reduce it to Writing, and meet you to morrow or when ever you will appoint, to prove it.

F. D. Done.

With that, Mr. Clayton took Pen and Ink to write down the Point.

F. D. What satisfaction will this be to the Woman?

Mrs. Joy. Why what must I do, if I find you are not to be believ'd.

Mr. C. Mr. Nary in his Book asserts, that in a Dispute with *Hereticks* one may suppress the truth, and gives it as the chief reason; for St. Austine and the Fathers denying of *Transubstantiation*, and calling it a sign and figure of Christs body and blood.

F. D. Mr. Nary would never say any such thing,

Mrs. Joy, Nay Dr. Clayton shewed me that in his Book, and I desired a Copy of it, and here it is out of 148 p. which was Read, Mr. C. What say you to this?

F. D. If Mr. Nary has done an unadvised thing, let him Answer for it himself.

M. C. But do not you the same, to come to a point and dare not stand the Test.

F. D. What is this to the point we fix'd on of Transubstantiation, does not Scripture say, This is my body.

M. C. Again I say it is about the sense of those words we contend, If those words were spok without a figure, pray you how many bodys had Christ, was he in the body, or out of the body, when he consecrated and administered it?

F. D. He has only one body.

Mr. C. were not the body with which he Consecrated it and the body Consecrated, two bodys?

F. D. No, no more than his natural body and glorified body are two.

Mr. C. He had not both these at a time, but he had both the other at one time, besides he administer'd to Peter, and James, and John, and all the 12 either distinct pieces or so many bodys, to which gave he the head? and to which the foot? had not St. Peter and St. James two distinct bodys?

F. D. No, one body.

Mr. C. Pray you assign me the propertys that make bodys distinct and i'le

F.D. They are distinguished by their essences, and Christ had one miraculous essence.

Mr. C. Then we can distinguish no bodys in the world to be two if this be the only distinction, for we know not the Essence of any thing.

F. D. Yes I know the Essence of Man to be Animal Rationale.

Mr. C. That is not his Essence, but specifick difference.

F. D. There's no Philosopher in the world, but asserts it to be the essence of man.

Mr. Cl. It is so far from that, that some rather Define man to be an animal Religiosum. But tho' I approve of the distinction of rationality better, yet I assert, that was never said to be his Essence, but a specifick difference flowing from the Essence.

F. D. I will lay you any Wager all Philosophers in the World assert it to be his Essence?

Mr. C. Let us reduce it to Writing, and I will take you up, and lay any Sum to a hundred Pound.

F. D. I would not offend you.

Mr. C. You do not offend me, unless it be by offering things you will not stick to, but I pardon you that too, for I have more hopes you may leave your Religion.

F. D. What is the Essence of Man?

M. C. What no man knows, some thing that God has given us flowing from his Essence, who is the Essence of all things, for in him we live, move and have our being, but we are got off from the Point. Rationality is no more the Essence of man, than quantity and place, and the peculiar specifick properties of certain bodies are their Essence, and by these, I can prove the pieces of bread given St. James and St. Peter, two bodies.

F. D. Two bodies may be in one place, as when our Saviour enter'd the doors being shut, for Omnipotence can do any thing.

Mr. C. You prove an obscure thing by a more obscure. But there is no such Text that I remember that words it after that manner, nor such as may import any more, than that he came when they had shut the door for fear of the Jews, but whether they open'd them to him, or he might be invisibly in the Room before, having miraculously conceal'd himself, or some other way, I find nothing imports necessariiy any penetration; but suppose I cannot assign the manner, does it necessarily follow, that a manner contrary to all grounds of reason, and Philosophy must be allow'd.

F. D. Can any thing be more plain, than that he enter'd the doors being shut, is any thing impossible with God?

Mr. C. Yes, many things as contradictions, he cannot make a thing to be and not to be at the same time, God cannot lie and the like; but first, I remember not any Text thus worded, that he enter'd the doors being shut, give here the Bible.

Mrs. Joy. Let Mr. Dalton find his Proof himself.

F. D. I suppose Mr. Clayton can find the place.

Mr. C. Not yours.

F. D. Mine is about the 20th of St. John. I am not fairly dealt with, I was surpriz'd, and might not be prepared for such a dispute.

Mr. C. I le assure you, I had neither preparation nor thought of Surprizing you, I could not fix on any Point, 'tis your choice she scrupl'd Communion in one kind, most to me.

F. D. And you go against the Doctrine of your own Church, do not they hold the real presence?

M.C. I assert it positively.

F. D. And how can Christ be really there, and not corporally there? where ever Jesus Christ is, there his body is.

Mr. C. I'me positive that is false Doctrine, Jesus Christ is really in the Sacrament of Baptism but not corporally, Jesus Christ was really in Abraham's time but not his body; where ever the Second Person of the Trinity is, there is Jesus Christ, 'tis damnable Heresy, to confine his Divinity to Humanity, and rob him of his omnipresence, which is an Atribute of him as he is God.

F. D. Since the union, where ever Jesus Christ is, there his body is. If any man ever beside yourself said, Jesus Christ was in the Sacrament of Baptism, Ple yield the cause, I mean any of the Fathers.

M.C. I always take you at your word, I le put it to the issue.

F. D. Done.

Mr. C. Give me Paper, Pen and Ink. Which was brought, and Mr. Clayton wrote, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament of Baptism: this is the Point, is it not?

F. D. Yes.

M. C. Set your hand to it, and the hour I must meet to morrow or any other day, and i le prove it or yield the cause, for i le bring more than one of the Fathers that assert it within the five first Centuries.

F. D. Ple not set my hand to appoint a solemn Disputation.

M. C. No we will have no more Disputation, it is whether I can bring any Fathers that assert this, you have nothing to prove.

F. D. You said, that what's asserted was Heresy, where ever Christ is there his body is, this i le give under my hand, if you le give under your hand it is Heresy.

Mr. Clayton agreed to Write. Father Dalton wrote then under the aforesaid Position, that Christ is really in the Sacrament of Baptism: I assert, that where ever Jesus Christ is there his body is.

Subscribed, Dalton.

And Mr. Clayton writ the same, asserting it *Heresy*.

Subscribed, J. Clayton.

F. D. All the Fathers Ignatius, Ieremius, St. Cyprian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostome and all the rest, ever held Transubstantiation, ours is the Catholick Church, and yours was never before Luther, nay, there was never any before the late Sect of the Presbyterians in England, deny'd the corporal presence, and this a Bishop of your own asserts.

Mr. C. Did not many suffer throughout several Ages, for denying particularly in Henry the 8th's time this Article of *Transubstantiation*, 'tis to false, I dare say, no Priest nor inferior Clergyman of our Church, could say any such thing, name the Person.

F. D. Bishop Parker.

Mr. C. A special Church of *England* Man as you could have named, unless Gardiner in Queen Marys days, yet he lived not to ripen to that pitch, and never asserted any such; I know what you hint at.

F. D. Your Church Catechism asserts the body to be verily and indeed in the Sacrament?

Mr. C. You may well be confident, all the Fathers asserted *Transubstantiation*, that can out face this.

F. D. It is certainly so.

Mr. C. It says, the inward part or thing signified, is the body and blood of Christ. Now to signify only such a thing in my sense, is to assert the body, is not there in a Transubstantiated sense, as plainly as words can in part express, and that this was sense of the *Comoners*, has convincing Testimony of being Seal'd with their blood; for most of them died in Queen Marys time rather than Subscribe it. But you mentioned several Fathers held *Transubstantiation*, name any one, I give you your choice, and if I do not show they have explain'd themselves, as to whatever raptures they have express'd relating thereto, as plainly as if I should say, that this is *London*, and then say, that it is the Picture of *London* I will yield, not always imminately, but in some part of their Writings, and 'tis sufficient to say it once for all, give me but moderate allowance for the height of expression, and name the Author which you please.

F. D. St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Chrysostome.

Mr. C. I have read all the one, and enough of the other to consent thereto, 'tis Concluded, name your time.

F. D. No, I le enter into no publick Disputes, it is dangerous for the times and my Eyes are weak, I cannot read above half an hour.

Mr. C. Ple secure you Body for Body.

F. D. You must prove the 39 Articles, and that you was before Luther, and that you are a Catholick Church and your Succession.

Mr.

M. C. And a thousand things at once, let us determine the Point already
in debate, - I allow the Authors named, let us pursue the Head we are upon,
name your time.

F. D. No, Write what you have a mind, it shall be Answered, tho' I will not
say I will Answer it.

M. C. I have Writ already, that shou'd be Answer'd, before I think my self
oblig'd to offer more.

F. D. Sir, I respect your Learning.

Mr. C. I respect your Person, and am a Friend to all of your Religion, but
an utter Enemy to the Religion it self.

F. D. Good Night.

Mr. C. Adieu.

D U B L I N: Printed by Fr. Dickson, at the Oxman-
town Coffee-House in Church-Street, 1702.

Price two Pence.

Prix trois Francs

DUBLIN: Printed by Mr. Dillon at the Oxmantown College-Hall in Chapel-Street 1805.



i
i
o
1
1
5

W C